

**CMER Meeting
May 15, 2003
NWIFC Conference Center
Draft Minutes**

Attendees:

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Butts, Sally | USFWS |
| Clark, Jeffrey | Weyerhaeuser |
| Ehinger, Bill | DOE |
| Fransen, Brian | Weyerhaeuser |
| Harlow, Eric | WFLC |
| Hunter, Mark | WDFW |
| Jackson, Terry | WDFW |
| MacCracken, Jim | Longview Fibre |
| Martin, Doug | CMER co-chair, WFPA Consultant |
| McConnell, Steve | NWIFC |
| McDonald, Dennis | DNR |
| McFadden, George | NWIFC |
| McNaughton, Geoff | Adaptive Management Program Administrator |
| Mobbs, Mark | Quinault Indian Nation |
| Palmquist, Bob | NWIFC |
| Parks, Dave | DNR |
| Pavel, Joseph | NWIFC |
| Peterson, Pete | UCUT |
| Price, Dave | WDFW |
| Pucci, Dawn | Suquamish Tribe |
| Quinn, Tim | CMER co-chair, WDFW |
| Raines, Mary | NWIFC |
| Robinson, Tom | WSAOC |
| Rodgers, Charlene | DNR |
| Rowe, Blake | Longview Fibre |
| Rowton, Heather | WFPA |
| Schroff, Eric | DNR |
| Schuett-Hames, David | NWIFC |
| Sturhan, Nancy | DNR |

Summary of Decisions and Tasks

| Decision/Task | Section of Minutes |
|--|------------------------------------|
| April CMER minutes approved | Approve Minutes and Review Actions |
| The budget sheet will be reworked per FPB and FFR Policy Direction. For details, see the budget update section of the minutes. At the August 13 th FPB meeting, an additional \$430,000 will be requested for the Type N buffer effectiveness study. | Budget Update |

| | |
|---|---------------------------|
| <p>Type N Demarcation Pilot Study Report: Jim MacCracken, Bill Ehinger, Mike Haggerty, Paul Bakke, David Luzi, and Eric Kraus were or will be approached to review this report. The target completion date for this review is to complete it within five weeks. McFadden asked that the dedicated reviewers provide comments back on this process to the Handbook Committee so that improvements can be made. A report will occur at the June CMER meeting and final results will be delivered when they are available. A CMER review of the policy options will occur after this scientific review is completed.</p> | SAG Requests |
| <p>DNR is seeking stakeholder involvement in the compliance monitoring protocol development and will provide another update at the July CMER meeting.</p> | Compliance Monitoring |
| <p>CMER staff is currently incorporating comments into the workplan draft and a final version will be available soon. Rowton will draft a schedule for workplan development for the 2004 budget and CMER will consider this schedule at their June meeting.</p> | Workplan |
| <p>SAGs were asked to review and discuss the CMER draft staff time dedications (contact McNaughton for a copy of this report). Final recommendations on staff allocations will be made at the June CMER meeting.</p> <p>UPSAG members will meet with Geoff McNaughton and Dave Schuett-Hames to discuss how UPSAG can get their staffing needs met.</p> | Staffing |
| <p>CMER can help the intensive/extensive monitoring effort by framing critical questions and hypotheses for testing. CMER was also asked to prioritize these critical questions and hypotheses.</p> <p>SAGs should come prepared to discuss critical questions and hypotheses at the June CMER meeting.</p> <p>Ehinger and Bilby will update CMER on funding for intensive monitoring following the July SRF Board meeting. Ehinger and Bilby will also provide a brief summary of the work they have done to seek funding for and collaboration on intensive monitoring and further development of a study design if applicable. This is an appropriate time-for suggestions of critical questions and hypotheses from CMER members that may be considered in an intensive monitoring program.</p> | Afternoon Science Session |

Approve Minutes and Review Actions:

Minutes from the May CMER meeting were approved as amended. Action items were reviewed.

Budget Update: CMER projects presented yesterday to the FPB were approved. These include:

- \$40,000 to identify the patterns of habitat use for Dunn's and Van Dyke's salamanders
- \$71,000 RSAG assisting DNR and USFS in collecting pre-treatment data for a Type N stream buffer effectiveness study
- \$200,000 (maximum) for ISAG to replicate the eastside data collection effort.
- \$15,000 for RSAG to help fund development of a red-alder growth and yield model.
- \$80,000 for Westside fish model validation study

The budget sheet was also distributed at this meeting. Contact McNaughton if you would like a copy. McNaughton will be reworking this budget sheet, at the request of the FPB and FFR Policy, to make it understandable for both the current year and future years. To help with this reworking, CMER will need to reconsider projections for the out-years. Projects will also be costed out on an annual basis through 2010. Quinn suggested that in the future, we add a footnote indicating what fund the money is coming from and when it can be spent.

There are also adaptive management funding needs that fall outside CMER's purview. For example, the FFR policy budget subcommittee allocated \$100,000 towards the development of the small landowner database. Compliance monitoring protocol development also falls outside CMER, as does CMER research waiver development. This emphasizes the importance of CMER getting priority projects up and running using all available funds before they can be reallocated.

McNaughton will also be attempting to bring projects to the FPB on annual basis rather than in the form of individual projects as have come forward to date.

The type N streams study is underway but only has \$50,000 startup money approved by the FPB at this time, rather than the \$480,000 they requested. They will need substantially more money to have an active study this field season. Schuett-Hames said that when a decision was made, it was to go ahead with two strata. RSAG will then report back to CMER in two years. The FPB meets again on August 13th and McNaughton will request the additional \$430,000 at that time.

The Landslide Hazard Zonation study has been approved to move forward and spend the \$800,000 that the FPB has already approved. A project review will be needed in one year to discuss project status and options for moving forward. Pavel commented that the review is to see which high priority areas are being mapped and to look for opportunities

to extend the funding on this project over more years. Quinn added that there was concern about what the added benefit from this project as well (i.e. how much added value in resource protection will we get from this expenditure).

SAG Requests:

UPSAG: UPSAG requested CMER review of the Type N demarcation pilot study. UPSAG is forming a technical advisory group for this project. If you are interested, contact Julie Dieu with Rayonier or any other UPSAG member. Through fall, there will likely be 4-5 meetings of this technical advisory group. The report will be released on a CD on Monday for people to review. There are several products for review: the report, an executive summary, policy options, and a whitepaper. UPSAG is asking that this review group look at each of these products and provide comments and recommendations. If you would like copies of these documents, please contact Bob Palmquist.

The report is basically the same as before, but sample areas are more fully characterized. The data are also analyzed pooled ecoregion. There is more channel distance data depicting how far downstream perennial flow starts relative to the channel and how far downstream do the default basin sizes predict that flow will start. This allows more suitable analysis of impacts. The basin sizes observed are much smaller than the default sizes in current rules.

CMER Consensus: Jim MacCracken and Bill Ehinger, Mike Haggerty, Paul Bakke, David Luzi, and Eric Kraus were or will be approached. The target completion date for this review is to complete it within five weeks. McFadden asked that the dedicated reviewers provide comments back on this process to the Handbook Committee so that improvements can be made. A report will occur at the June CMER meeting and final results will be delivered when they are available. A CMER review of the policy options will occur after this scientific review is completed.

SRC Update: There is a signed interagency agreement for the SRC. McNaughton said that we did get an overhead waiver on this agreement because we became members of the cooperative state effort. McNaughton will meet with the managers at the UW to ensure that we can work well together and that goals will be accomplished. Double-blind reviews were discussed briefly. Sometimes they will work well and other times, the reviewers will need to meet with CMER cooperators to reach a common understanding.

Compliance Monitoring: Schroff updated CMER that the compliance monitoring protocol development is progressing. The group is moving forward and will report to CMER on a regular basis. The broad purpose of this process is to develop methods, protocols and a proposed work plan for compliance monitoring for Forest practices. The outcome goal is to determine how well the rules are being implemented.

They have discussed DNR heading the compliance monitoring effort, while working cooperatively with FFR partners. There is a wide range of connections in compliance monitoring which will all be considered. For example, there are obvious links with extensive and effectiveness monitoring. Links with certification will also be explored. There are also many other groups who are conducting compliance monitoring at this time. DNR is still in the scoping phase at this time and is looking at what others are doing, how they are doing it, and what they hope to accomplish. Charlene Rodgers is leading the effort with Eric Schroff for DNR.

Rodgers is gathering data and scoping information and is focusing what is and has been done in other states. Rodgers also wants to establish the stakeholder group as soon as possible. CMER is one partner, but others may be interested as well. Rodgers will be calling individuals to see who wants to be involved. Quinn suggested that the federal agencies also be approached with this. If you are interested in participating, please contact Charlene Rodgers at 360-902-1409.

DNR would like to have a framework by the end of September and would like to start monitoring by next spring. Schroff added that there will be a phased in approach to monitoring.

CMER requested another update in July. Schroff agreed and indicated that DNR would be happy to update CMER any time.

Rule Tools Update: Sturhan provided a handout – please contact her if you would like a copy. The bolded items on the list are those that DNR needs as soon as possible to implement the current rules. They include: stream typing, wetlands GIS layer, LHZ, regional unstable landforms, and glacial deep-seated landslides. Most of these are location focused, with the exception of glacial deep-seated landslides.

Hunter said that the growth and yield projects are not listed here. Sturhan said that she is only familiar with what DNR is going to work on and some tool development will be accomplished without the input of DNR. Sturhan asked that if people have comments and concerns, they contact her directly.

Schuett-Hames commented that this is useful information to understand what the DNR foresters need. It is also interesting that some of these priorities are different than the ones the stakeholders identified as important. We will need to reconcile those two different types of needs. Schuett-Hames also pointed out that some of these items are really validation. Martin said that some of this will be considered as the workplan is updated and we should consider it there.

Work Plan: Schuett-Hames updated CMER that they have heard from six SAGs on the workplan. Staff is now incorporating comments and will have another version of the workplan ready soon. The main change is that SAGE is going through a major change in

approach and re-scoping. Therefore, they are proposing a placeholder for SAGE at this time rather than program details. A wildlife program has also been added to the workplan. The current plan is for Palmquist and Schuett-Hames to incorporate these comments and then forward the workplan to the CMER co-chairs and Geoff for review. CMER will then see the final product. McNaughton will seek approval for the-workplan at the August 13th, FPB meeting.

The schedule for development of the 2004 workplan is: revisions from SAGs will be considered in September, CMER will approve the workplan in October (a special workshop will be scheduled for this) and the FPB will then approve in November. Sturhan suggested that this means that SAGs should begin considering revisions now. Quinn agreed and added that SAGs should be reconsidering these priorities on a continual basis, based on policy recommendations, FPB decisions and other relevant inputs. Schuett-Hames suggested that SAGs look to be sure that the workplan accurately reflects their projects and that CMER think ahead about any changes to the prioritization process that may be considered. Lastly, consider strategies and make sure they are accurately reflected in the workplan.

Assignment: Rowton will develop a formal schedule for consideration at the June CMER meeting.

Process improvement suggestions based on above discussion: note decisions from the science meetings and define what those sessions will consist of on the agenda (i.e. if decisions will be made, note that on the agenda), and, be sure to note decisions made during the science session in CMER meeting minutes.

SAG Issues:

RSAG: has a meeting tomorrow with LWAG to discuss integrating amphibian research with Type N studies.

BTSAG: There is now a formal co-chair for Bull Trout (Sally Butts, USFWS). They will hold a meeting on June 4th to discuss sites. A reminder, the funding was cut in half to \$550,000 for this year. 2004 funding is still a question mark and no one is sure what will happen.

UPSAG: there is a contractor working on a roads sediment update. The last deliverable for this contractor is to present what they have done during a CMER afternoon science session. This may be ready as early as July. The co-chairs of UPSAG are changing: Nancy Sturhan and Dave Luzi are sharing Raines former position, Clark will be taking over Julie Dieu's role as the other co-chair. Clark and other CMER members thanked Mary Raines for all her hard work on UPSAG over the last two years.

SAGE: the literature contract for wood in streams is out and the contractor did well on this. Nomograph preliminary results will be coming in next month, but there are far less sites than they had hoped for. Some in SAGE are under the opinion that they need to

begin gathering specific data for what they need, rather than gathering data for the entire eastside at once. Schuett-Hames suggested that SAGE separate rule tools from validation.

Staffing: McNaughton updated CMER that there was a meeting about ten days ago to discuss staffing needs. A handout accompanied his discussion. Everyone at the meeting agreed that we need more help for CMER. Budget-makers however, continue to see the \$340,000 figure for CMER staff and want to know what this means. We need to make staffing work much more transparent so that all the budget-makers can see what we are doing. The group did look at the formal staff requests submitted by the SAGs. Those requests alone far exceeded the staff availability. Ongoing projects are the highest priority and allocations for new projects will be prioritized from the top of the priority list down. Updates on how staff is being used will be a standing agenda item during each CMER meeting. Rowe did say that Palmquist mentioned his LHZ work this morning and we need to get that information into the chart.

Pavel asked if, when CMER staff assume PI roles that are paid for by individual projects, we will backfill the staff time. There have been suggestions for using interagency agreements and/or RIFed employees to help with CMER work. McNaughton said that picking up the RIFed people will be difficult. Rowe suggested that we clearly distinguish between CMER staff administrative work and CMER staff project work; this will help policy to see the staffing needs more clearly. Raines said that the problem in UPSAG is getting the work done. We need to get really creative about how we fill these staffing needs – interagency agreements, RFPs and RFQQs seeking contract help, and other ideas should be considered.

Assignment: SAGs should review and discuss the staff recommendations in McNaughton's report and final recommendations for CMER staffing will be made at the June meeting. Raines said this is not acceptable to her.

Further discussion ensued and it was agreed that UPSAG members will meet with Geoff McNaughton and Dave Schuett-Hames to discuss how UPSAG can get their staffing needs met.

Science Conference Update: The first CMER Science Conference will be on February 24th, 2004 at the Capitol Campus. Quinn and Martin are coordinating and organizing the conference.

Science Topic: extensive monitoring and bull trout study status report (study design and logistical issues).

Afternoon Science Session – Extensive and Intensive Monitoring

Bilby and Ehinger provided a presentation explaining how the intensive monitoring is envisioned to work, what it will encompass, and how it will proceed. Please contact Heather Rowton for a copy the presentation. Bilby and Ehinger agreed to provide a written summary of their activities and progress on developing a research protocol and acquiring funding for intensive monitoring for CMER to consider and so that this program is well-documented.

CMER can help this process by framing critical questions and hypotheses for testing. CMER should also prioritize these critical questions and hypotheses. Ehinger and Bilby will update CMER on funding following the July SRF Board meeting. This is an appropriate time-for suggestions of critical questions and hypotheses from CMER members that may be considered in an intensive monitoring program.